

REMARKS

Claims 11-13 and 15 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 14 and 16 have been amended and new claims 17 and 18 have been added. Claims 14, 16, 17 and 18 are pending.

DRAWINGS

The drawings were objected to as not showing the following features specified in the claims:

1. "The recovery flow path arranged on a more radially inner side than said supply path (claims 11-13)".
2. "The flow path provided with a flow adjusting mechanism (claim 14)".
3. "The fluid introduced into said gap portions is exhausted therefrom into a gas path of said glass turbine (claim 16)".

With respect to the recovery flow path arranged on a more radially inner side than said supply path, this is supported by the description at lines 6-8 of page 23 in the specification wherein it is stated "...it is possible to reverse

the supply port and the recovery port, that is, it is possible to flow the steam in reverse".

Being submitted concurrently herewith is an added Fig. 2a in which the arrows showing flow directions have been reversed to indicate reverse flow directions to that shown in Fig. 2. This drawing demonstrates that the recovering flow path 59 can be used for the supply flow path and the inner flow path 20 can be used for the recovery flow path as described in lines 6-8 on page 23 of the specification.

It is further noted that the specification has been amended in lines 6-8 on page 23 to refer to newly added Fig. 2a. Since new Fig. 2a merely illustrates what has been previously described in the specification, it is submitted that no new matter is added by the addition of Fig. 2a.

With respect to the limitation of the flow path provided with a flow adjusting mechanism, this was set forth in claim 15-- not claim 14 as stated in the Office Action-- and claim 15 has now been canceled.

With respect to the limitation of the fluid introduced into said gap portions is exhausted therefrom into a gas path of said gas turbine, this feature is illustrated in Fig. 1 by

the gas flow path 6a as shown in Fig. 1. Moreover, the specification on page 5, lines 18 and 19 refers to "an outer peripheral gas flow path 6a of the turbine rotor 1a". On page 6, lines 25 and 26 reference is made to "a peripheral side gas flow path 6a of the gas turbine 120". Finally, on page 14, lines 8-10 it is stated that "Then, the compressed air passes through the slit 89 and discharged into the gas flow path 6a through the cavity 90".

Thus, the compressed air is "the fluid" in claim 16 and "a gas flow path" is the gas flow path 6a as shown in Fig. 1. The remaining part of claim 16 is shown in Fig. 2. Moreover, claim 16 has been amended to refer to a "gas flow path" instead of only a "gas path". It is therefore submitted that no further drawings are necessary to show this feature.

#### IN THE SPECIFICATION

The specification has been amended on page 4 between lines 18 and 19 to add the description of newly added Fig. 2a.

Moreover, the specification has been amended at page 23, lines 6-8 to refer to Fig. 2a.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claims 14-16 were objected to because of improperly depending from canceled claim 1. By this amendment, claim 15 has been canceled and claims 14-16 have been rewritten in independent form by incorporating therein the limitations of independent claim 11.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Carreno et al, U.S. Patent 5,593,274. Claims 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Akiyama et al, U.S. Patent 6,334,756.

Claims 11-13 have now been canceled and therefore require no further comment.

**PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 14-16 have been rewritten in independent form, and therefore are now believed patentable in view of the Examiner's indication that these claims contained allowable

Appl. No. 10/782,961

Docket No. NIP-149-06

Amendment filed May 6, 2005

Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2005

subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

New claims 17 and 18 have been added in which claim 17 is claim 12 plus claim 14 and claim 18 is claim 13, plus claim 14. Since claim 14 was previously indicated to contain allowable subject matter, claim 17 and 18 are therefore believed allowable.

Appl. No. 10/782,961  
Amendment filed May 6, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2005

Docket No. NIP-149-06

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants contend that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be due in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 50-1417.

Respectfully submitted,



Gene W. Stockman  
Registration No. 21,021  
Attorney for Applicant

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.  
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1120  
Date: May 6, 2005